REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 9 to 20 are pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants note with appreciation the acknowledgment that the drawings submitted on May 6, 2002 are accepted.

II. Rejection of Claims 9, 15 and 16 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 9, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over European Published Patent Application No. 0 748 949 "(using U.S. Patent No. 5,704,597 to Hofmann et al. as an English equivalent)" ("Hofmann et al."). Office Action at p. 2. It is respectfully submitted that Hofmann et al. do not render obvious the present claims as amended herein for the following reasons.

Claim 9 relates to a vibration damper for limiting the formation of vibrations in a tubular propeller shaft in the drive train of a motor vehicle. The vibration damper includes a sleeve defining a radial and circumferential direction. A mass body is mounted concentrically in the sleeve. A plurality of rubber spring elements mounts the mass body to the sleeve. A plurality of flexible stop elements is disposed circumferentially between each adjacent pair of spring elements and is disposed between the mass body and the sleeve to define a discrete space for limiting a vibration travel of the mass body at least in the radial direction. A contact surface of each stop element extends over a larger circumferential angle than the spring elements and than a space between each stop element and an adjacent rubber spring element, such that each stop element occupies a large portion of a space between the mass body, the spring elements and the sleeve.

Hofmann et al. purport to relate to a radial bearing, particularly for a torque support in motor vehicle engines. According to Hofmann et al., the radial bearing includes an outer sleeve and an inner sleeve which is coaxial with the outer sleeve and is constructed as a bush core. Hofmann et al. state that the inner sleeve is provided on its outer periphery with at least one radially orientated elastomeric body and at least one rubber end stop. Hofmann et al. also state that the rubber end stop is active only after a predeterminable spring deflection of the elastomeric

body, and that the inner sleeve also has two mutually opposite elastic carrying bodies, through which the inner sleeve is elastically mounted on the outer sleeve. According to Hofmann et al., if there is a radial introduction of force, three linear characteristic curve ranges with different rigidity are present one after the other.

The Office Action states that Hofmann et al. show various features recited in claim 1, but admits that "[Hofmann et al.] do[] not specifically disclose that the spring elements are rubber." Office Action at p. 2. However, the Office Action contends that "Hofmann et al. teach in figures 2 and 3 the spring elements and the stop elements being shown with the same cross-hatching and disclose[] in line 6 of the abstract the stop elements being composed of rubber." Office Action at pp. 2 to 3. The Office Action concludes that "[i]t would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the spring elements of Hofmann et al. to have been made of rubber, in view of the teachings of Hofmann et al., in order to provide good shock absorbing properties." Office Action at p. 3.

Applicants respectfully submit that Hofmann et al. do not render obvious claim 9 for at least the reason that Hofmann et al. fail to disclose, or even suggest, all of the limitations recited in claim 9. For example, Hofmann et al. fail to disclose, or even suggest, a contact surface of each stop element that extends over a larger circumferential angle than the spring elements and than a space between each stop element and an adjacent rubber spring element, as recited in claim 9. This arrangement enables the vibration travel in the central compression direction of a rubber spring element 31, 32 to be only insignificantly greater than in the central compression direction of a stop element 41, 42. Specification at p. 5, lines 7 to 10. In contrast, the flexible stop elements, e.g., the elastomeric bodies 21 and 22, of Hofmann et al. have a contact surface that contacts sleeve 11 over a fairly narrow circumferential angle. This circumferential angle is about equal to the circumferential angle defined by the spring elements, e.g., carrying bodies 17a and 17b, and is much smaller than the circumferential angle defined by the space between the elastomeric body 21, the carrying body 17a and outer sleeve 11.

Furthermore, Hofmann et al. fail to disclose, or even suggest, a vibration damper for limiting the formation of vibrations in a tubular propeller shaft in the drive train of a motor vehicle, as recited in claim 9. The vibration damper of the present invention relates to an element that has no connection to the mass body.

Since the vibration damper of the present invention merely provides an additional mechanical degree of freedom for the rotating propeller shaft, the vibration damper counteracts, or limits, the formation of a potential vibration. By contrast, the vibration damper of Hofmann et al. operates to prevent the transmission of a vibration that has already occurred in its component from being transmitted to the vehicle body. Col. 3, lines 53-55. Thus, the vibration damper of Hofmann et al. merely decouples a vibration that has occurred with respect to the vehicle body, but does not limit the formation of a vibration in a tubular propeller shaft, as recited in amended claim 9.

To establish prima facie obviousness, three criteria must be satisfied. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify or combine reference teachings. In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). This teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination must be found in the prior art and not based on the application disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. In re Merck & Co., Inc., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 U.S.P.Q. 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Third, the prior art reference(s) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974). Since Hofmann et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, all of the limitations of claim 9 as more fully set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that Hofmann et al. do not render obvious claim 9.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the cases of In re Fine, supra, and In re Jones, 21 U.S.P.Q.2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992), make plain that the Office Action's generalized assertions that it would have been obvious to modify or combine the reference do not properly support a § 103 rejection. It is respectfully submitted that those cases make plain that the Office Action reflects a subjective "obvious to try" standard, and therefore does not reflect the proper evidence to support an obviousness rejection based on the reference relied upon. In particular, the Court in the case of In re Fine stated that:

> The PTO has the burden under section 103 to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. It can satisfy this burden only by showing some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references. This it has not done. . . .

Instead, th Examiner relies on hindsight in reaching his obviousness determination. . . . One cannot us hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art to d pr cate th claimed invention.

In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1598 to 1600 (citations omitted; italics in original; emphasis added). Likewise, the Court in the case of In re Jones stated that:

> Before the PTO may combine the disclosures of two or more prior art references in order to establish *prima facie* obviousness, there must be some suggestion for doing so, found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. . . .
>
> **Conspicuously missing from this record is any evidence, other than the PTO's speculation (if it be called evidence) that one of ordinary skill . . . would have been motivated to make the modifications . . . necessary to arrive at the claimed [invention].**

In re Jones, 21 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1943, 1944 (citations omitted; italics in original).

That is exactly the case here since it is believed and respectfully submitted that the present Office Action offers no evidence whatsoever, but only conclusory hindsight, reconstruction and speculation, which these cases have indicated does not constitute evidence that will support a proper obviousness finding. Unsupported assertions are not evidence as to why a person having ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to modify or combine references to provide the claimed subject matter of the claims to address the problems met thereby. Accordingly, the Office must provide proper evidence of a motivation for modifying or combining the reference to provide the claimed subject matter.

More recently, the Federal Circuit in the case of In re Kotzab has made plain that even if a claim concerns a "technologically simple concept" -- which is not the case here -- there still must be some finding as to the "specific understanding or principle within the knowledge of a skilled artisan" that would motivate a person having no knowledge of the claimed subject matter to "make the combination in the manner claimed," stating that:

> In this case, the Examiner and the Board fell into the hindsight trap. The idea of a single sensor controlling multiple valves, as opposed to multiple sensors controlling multiple valves, is a

> technologically simple concept. With this simple concept in mind, the Patent and Trademark Office found prior art statements that in the abstract appeared to suggest the claimed limitation. But, there was no finding as to the specific understanding or principle within the knowledge of a skilled artisan that would have motivated one with no knowledge of Kotzab's invention to make the combination in the manner claimed. In light of our holding of the absence of a motivation to combine the teachings in Evans, we conclude that the Board did not make out a proper prima facie case of obviousness in rejecting [the] claims . . . under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) over Evans.

In re Kotzab, 55 U.S.P.Q.2d 1313, 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (emphasis added). Again, it is believed that there have been no such findings.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Hofmann et al. do not render obvious claim 9. Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 15 and 16, which ultimately depend from claim 9, are also not rendered unpatentable by Hofmann et al. for at least the same reason given above in support of the patentability of claim 9. In re Fine, supra (any dependent claim depending from a non-obvious independent claim is non-obvious).

III. Rejection of Claims 9 to 12 and 17 to 20 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 9 to 12 and 17 to 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over British Published Patent Application No. 1 341 087 ("GB '087") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,971,456 ("Hori"). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of GB '087 and Hori does not render obvious the present claims as amended herein for the following reasons.

Claims 9, 11 and 17 to 20 are independent. Claim 11 relates to a vibration damper for limiting the formation of vibrations in a tubular propeller shaft in the drive train of a motor vehicle. Claim 11 recites that the vibration damper includes a sleeve defining a radial and circumferential direction, a mass body mounted concentrically in the sleeve and a plurality of rubber spring elements for mounting the mass body to the sleeve. At least one of the mass body and the sleeve at least partially form, in circumferentially opposite regions between the rubber spring elements, a plurality of stop elements configured to limit a vibration

travel of the mass body in at least the radial direction. The stop elements define discrete spaces and extend over a larger circumferential angle than the spring elements.

Claim 17 relates to a vibration damper for limiting the formation of vibrations in a tubular propeller shaft in the drive train of a motor vehicle. Claim 17 recites that the vibration damper includes a propeller shaft that defines a radial and a circumferential direction. A mass body is arranged concentrically in the propeller shaft. A plurality of rubber spring elements mount the mass body to the propeller shaft. A plurality of stop elements limit a vibration travel of the mass body at least in the radial direction. The stop elements are disposed between the mass body and the propeller shaft and circumferentially between each adjacent pair of rubber spring elements so as to define a discrete space. The stop elements include at least one of metal or rubber.

Claim 18 relates to a vibration damper for limiting the formation of vibrations in a tubular propeller shaft in the drive train of a motor vehicle including a propeller shaft defining a radial and a circumferential direction. A mass body is arranged concentrically in the propeller shaft. A plurality of rubber spring elements mount the mass body to the propeller shaft. At least one of the mass body and the propeller shaft at least partially form, in circumferentially opposite regions between the rubber spring elements, a plurality of stop elements configured to limit a vibration travel of the mass body in at least the radial direction, such that a vibration travel in a central compression direction of the plurality of rubber spring elements is insignificantly greater than in the central compression direction of the plurality of stop elements.

Claim 19 relates to a vibration damper for limiting the formation of vibrations in a tubular propeller shaft in the drive train of a motor vehicle. Claim 19 recites that the vibration damper includes a propeller shaft defining a radial and a circumferential direction. A mass body is arranged concentrically in the propeller shaft. A plurality of rubber spring elements mount the mass body to the propeller shaft. The mass body at least partially forms, in circumferentially opposite regions between the rubber spring elements, a plurality of stop elements configured to limit a vibration travel of the mass body in at least the radial direction, such that a vibration travel in a central compression direction of the plurality of rubber spring elements is

insignificantly greater than in the central compression direction of the plurality of stop elements.

Claim 20 relates to a vibration damper for limiting the formation of vibrations in a tubular propeller shaft in the drive train of a motor vehicle. Claim 20 recites that the vibration damper includes a propeller shaft defining a radial and a circumferential direction. A mass body is arranged concentrically in the propeller shaft. A plurality of rubber spring elements mount the mass body to the propeller shaft. The propeller shaft at least partially forms, in circumferentially opposite regions between the rubber spring elements, a plurality of stop elements configured to limit a vibration travel of the mass body in at least the radial direction, such that a vibration travel in a central compression direction of the plurality of rubber spring elements is insignificantly greater than in the central compression direction of the plurality of stop elements.

GB '087 purports to relate to an intermediate shaft bearing assembly in a motor vehicle that includes a resiliently deformable body located between two concentric rigid annular members. Page 1, lines 34 to 36. The rigid outer member is secured against rotation, and the rigid inner ring accommodate a bearing for a shaft. Page 1, lines 36 to 39. The deformable body consists of a plurality of peripherally distributed web members which connect the two rigid rings to each other. Page 1, lines 39 to 43. Resilient abutments are attached to one of the rings between the web members. Page 1, lines 43 to 45. The surface of each abutment which faces the other ring is at a distance from the other rigid ring. Page 1, lines 45 to 47.

Hori purports to relate to a fluid-filled elastic center bearing mount. Hori states that an elastic body includes a pair of integrally formed elastic protrusions 32, which protrude a suitable distance radially outwardly into respective third and fourth pockets 26, 27. Col. 5, lines 18 to 21. Hori further states that the elastic body 16 includes a pair of integrally formed elastic stops 34, which protrude a suitable distance into the respective first and second pockets 24, 25. Col. 5, lines 31 to 33. Hori states at col. 7, lines 48 to 51 that the elastic stops 34 serve to protect the elastic body 16 from an excessive amount of elastic deformation when the mount 10 receives vibrations of a considerably large magnitude.

With regard to claims 9 to 12 and 17 to 20, the Office Action contends that GB '087 discloses various features recited in the claims, but admits that "[GB

'087] does not specifically disclose the limitation of the elastic spring elements being composed of rubber and does not disclose the limitation wherein the stop elements extend over a larger circumferential angle than the spring elements." Office Action at p. 4. However, the Office Action contends that "Hori teaches . . . the use of the elastic members of a vibration damper being composed of rubber," Office Action at p. 4, and concludes that "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the elastic spring elements of the vibration damper of [GB '087] to have been composed of rubber or any suitable elastic material, as taught by Hori, in order to provide good shock absorbing properties," Office Action at p. 4. In addition, the Office Action contends that "Hori teaches in figure 1 the limitation wherein the stop elements 32, 34 extend over a larger circumferential angle than the spring elements 16 shown in the area of element numbers 16, 24, 25 and 27," Office Action at p. 4, and concludes that "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the stop elements and spring elements of [GB '087] to have included stop elements extending over a larger circumferential angle than the spring elements, as taught by Hori, in order to provide more radial flexibility in the damper since the stops are spaced a distance away from one of the sleeve and mass body," Office Action at p. 4.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of GB '087 and Hori does not render obvious claims 9, 11 and 17 for at least the reason that the combination of GB '087 and Hori fails to disclose, or even suggest, all of the limitations recited in claims 9, 11 and 17. For example, the combination of GB '087 and Hori fails to disclose, or even suggest, a plurality of flexible stop elements disposed circumferentially between each adjacent pair of spring elements and between the mass body and the sleeve to define a discrete space. Figure 1 of the present application illustrates discrete spaces 45 defined between the flexible rubber stop elements 41, 42 and the sleeve 10 or the body mass 51. In contrast, GB '087 describes flexible stop elements, e.g., abutments 17, that are narrower in an axial direction than spring elements, e.g., web members 16. Page 1, line 89 to page 2, line 3. Figure 2 of GB '087 illustrates that, because the axial dimensions of both the abutments 17 and the web members 16 are narrower than a width of the rigid outer ring 10, the spaces defined therebetween are not discrete but interconnected. Figure 2 and page 2, lines 69 to 72. Furthermore, the spaces, e.g., the pockets 24,

25, 26 and 27, of Hori are not discrete because they are open through respective windows 28 (col. 5, lines 13 to 15).

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of GB '087 and Hori does not render obvious claims 18, 19 and 20 for at least the reason that the combination of GB '087 and Hori fails to disclose, or even suggest, all of the limitations recited in claims 18, 19 and 20. For example, the combination of GB '087 and Hori fails to disclose, or even suggest, that at least one of a mass body and a propeller shaft at least partially form a plurality of stop elements. With respect to quadrant IV of Figure 1 of the present application, there is illustrated a mass body 53 that has the cross-section of a four sided polygon, wherein the exposed polygon regions lie opposite the open undulation troughs 16 of sleeve 15. Specification at p. 6, lines 1 to 3. Thus, it is the shape of either the mass body 53 and the sleeve 15 that enables at least one of the mass body 53 or the sleeve 15 to form, and to function as, a stop element, and a separate rubber stop element is not required to be disposed therebetween. In contrast, the mass bodies and sleeves of both GB '087 and Hori have circular cross-sections that do not form part of a stop element, but instead employ rubber stop elements disposed between the mass bodies and the sleeves for this purpose. Thus, neither GB '087 nor Hori discloses, or even suggests, that the mass body or a propeller shaft at least partially form a plurality of stop elements.

Furthermore, neither GB '087 nor Hori disclose, or even suggest, a vibration damper for limiting the formation of vibrations in a tubular propeller shaft in the drive train of a motor vehicle, as recited in claims 9, 11 and 17 to 20. As stated above, the vibration damper of the present invention relates to an element that has no connection to the mass body. Since the vibration damper of the present invention merely provides an additional mechanical degree of freedom for the rotating propeller shaft, the vibration damper counteracts, or limits, the formation of a potential vibration in the propeller shaft. By contrast, the vibration damper of GB '087 operates to prevent the transmission of a vibration that has already occurred in its component from being transmitted to the vehicle body. Col. 2, lines 37-39. Thus, the vibration damper of GB '087 merely decouples a vibration that has occurred with respect to the vehicle body, but does not limit the formation of a vibration in a tubular propeller shaft, as recited in amended claims 9, 11 and 17 to 20.

Since the combination of GB '087 and Hori does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the limitations of claims 9, 11 and 17 to 20 as more fully set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of GB '087 and Hori does not render obvious claims 9, 11 and 17 to 20. Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10 and 12, which depend from claims 9 and 11, respectively, are also not rendered unpatentable by the combination of GB '087 and Hori for at least the same reason given above in support of the patentability of claims 9 and 11. In re Fine, supra (any dependent claim depending from a non-obvious independent claim is non-obvious).

IV. Rejection of Claim 14 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over GB '087 in view of Hori as applied to claim 9 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,988,071 ("Shimazaki"). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of GB '087, Hori and Shimazaki does not render obvious claim 14 for the following reasons.

Claim 14 depends from claim 9 and therefore includes all of the limitations of claim 9. Since claim 14 depends from independent claim 9, and since Shimazaki simply does not cure the critical deficiencies of GB '087 and Hori, as more fully described above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 14 is allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 9 is allowable. Id.

V. Rejection of Claim 13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over GB '087 in view of Hori as applied to claim 11 and further in view of French Published Patent Application No. 2,720,132 ("Michel"). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of GB '087, Hori and Michel does not render obvious claim 13 for the following reasons.

Claim 13 depends from claim 11 and therefore includes all of the limitations of claim 11. Since claim 13 depends from independent claim 11, and since Michel simply does not cure the critical deficiencies of GB '087 and Hori, as more fully described above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13 is allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 11 is allowable. Id.

VI. Conclusion

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the claims by the current Amendment. The attached pages are captioned "**V rsion with Markings to Show Changes Made**."

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

Dated: November 5, 2002 By: Richard L. Mayer by [signature] Reg. No. 42,194

Richard L. Mayer
Reg. No. 22,490

One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646

26646
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

511134

Version with Markings to Show Changes Made

IN THE CLAIMS:

Claims 9, 11 and 17 to 20 have been amended without prejudice as follows:

9. (Three Times Amended) A vibration damper for limiting the formation of vibrations in a tubular propeller shaft in the drive train of a motor vehicle, the vibration damper comprising:

a sleeve, the sleeve defining a radial and circumferential direction;

a mass body mounted concentrically in the sleeve;

a plurality of rubber spring elements for mounting the mass body to the sleeve; and

a plurality of flexible stop elements disposed circumferentially between each adjacent pair of spring elements and disposed between the mass body and the sleeve to define a discrete space to limit a vibration travel of the mass body at least in the radial direction, wherein a contact surface of each stop element extends over a larger circumferential angle than the spring elements and than a space between each stop element and an adjacent rubber spring element, such that each stop element occupies [and occupy] a large portion of a space between the mass body, the spring elements and the sleeve.

11. (Twice Amended) A vibration damper for limiting the formation of vibrations in a tubular propeller shaft in the drive train of a motor vehicle, the vibration damper comprising:

a sleeve, the sleeve defining a radial and circumferential direction;

a mass body mounted concentrically in the sleeve;

a plurality of rubber spring elements for mounting the mass body to the sleeve; and

wherein at least one the mass body and the sleeve at least partially form, in circumferentially opposite regions between the rubber spring elements, a plurality of stop elements configured to limit a vibration travel of the mass body in at least the radial direction, wherein the stop elements define discrete spaces and wherein a contact surface of each stop element extends [extend] over a larger circumferential

angle than the spring elements and than a space between each stop element and an adjacent rubber spring element.

17. (Three Times Amended) A vibration damper for limiting the formation of vibrations in a tubular propeller shaft in the drive train of a motor vehicle, the vibration damper comprising:

a propeller shaft, the propeller shaft defining a radial and a circumferential direction;

a mass body arranged concentrically in the propeller shaft;

a plurality of rubber spring elements for mounting the mass body to the propeller shaft; and

a plurality of stop elements configured to limit a vibration travel of the mass body at least in the radial direction, the stop elements being disposed between the mass body and the propeller shaft and circumferentially between each adjacent pair of rubber spring elements so as to define a discrete space, the stop elements including at least one of metal or rubber.

18. (Twice Amended) A vibration damper for limiting the formation of vibrations in a tubular propeller shaft in the drive train of a motor vehicle, the vibration damper comprising:

a propeller shaft defining a radial and a circumferential direction;

a mass body arranged concentrically in the propeller shaft; and

a plurality of rubber spring elements for mounting the mass body to the propeller shaft;

wherein at least one of the mass body and the propeller shaft at least partially form, in circumferentially opposite regions between the rubber spring elements, a plurality of stop elements configured to limit a vibration travel of the mass body in at least the radial direction, such that a vibration travel in a central compression direction of the plurality of rubber spring elements is insignificantly greater than in the central compression direction of the plurality of stop elements.

19. (Twice Amended) A vibration damper for limiting the formation of vibrations in a tubular propeller shaft in the drive train of a motor vehicle, the vibration damper comprising:

a propeller shaft defining a radial and a circumferential direction;

a mass body arranged concentrically in the propeller shaft; and

a plurality of rubber spring elements for mounting the mass body to the propeller shaft;

wherein the mass body at least partially forms, in circumferentially opposite regions between the rubber spring elements, a plurality of stop elements configured to limit a vibration travel of the mass body in at least the radial direction, such that a vibration travel in a central compression direction of the plurality of rubber spring elements is insignificantly greater than in the central compression direction of the plurality of stop elements.

20. (Twice Amended) A vibration damper for limiting the formation of vibrations in a tubular propeller shaft in the drive train of a motor vehicle, the vibration damper comprising:

a propeller shaft defining a radial and a circumferential direction;

a mass body arranged concentrically in the propeller shaft; and

a plurality of rubber spring elements for mounting the mass body to the propeller shaft;

wherein the propeller shaft at least partially forms, in circumferentially opposite regions between the rubber spring elements, a plurality of stop elements configured to limit a vibration travel of the mass body in at least the radial direction, such that a vibration travel in a central compression direction of the plurality of rubber spring elements is insignificantly greater than in the central compression direction of the plurality of stop elements.